

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 12 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagi. Claims 7, 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Kim. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Kashiwazaki. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Iijima. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Narutaki. Claims 5-16 have been cancelled. Consequently, these rejections are now moot.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Chang. Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view Chang and further in view of Kim. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 2. In addition, dependent claim 3 has been placed in independent form. Following these amendments independent claims 1 and 3 now claim a transfective liquid crystal display that includes a three-peak type LED backlight source and a color filter with an aperture. As described in the specification, the combination of these three elements work together to provide results that would not be expected from the results obtained from using these elements individually.

Specifically, although three-peak type light sources are typically used to improve color reproducibility of a transmissive display, three-peak light sources are not typically used to improve reflective displays. As described in the specification on page 12, lines 17-22 "Although the three-peak type light source is known to improve color reproducibility of a transmissible display, in the present invention, it was found that the three-peak type light source may improve not only the color characteristics of a transmissible display but also the color characteristics of a reflective display using environmental light." In addition, page 33, line 22 to page 34 line 2 of the specification states that "it was found that the three-peak type LED light source has a significant effect on the object of

the present invention to achieve the high color reproducibility of the transmissive display and the excellent color characteristics (color reproducibility and brightness) of the reflective display.”

The further addition of a color filter to a transfective display with a three-peak type LED was shown to produce unexpected results. Table 2 in the specification discloses the reflective region chromaticity of colored films. Example 1 (which includes transfective liquid crystal display, a three-peak type LED backlight source, and a color filter) shows an improvement of 52% in the color reproducibility as compared to comparative example 1 in which a two-peak type LED was used. In addition, Example 2 shows an improvement of 12% in the brightness as compared to comparative example 1, in which a two-peak type LED was used. Finally, in Table 5 the brightness of comparative example 6 is low (26.8) in comparison to the other examples because comparative example 6 does not include the aperture on the color filter.

Accordingly, since none of the prior art references cited by the Examiner show a display with the claimed combination of a transfective liquid crystal display, a three-peak type LED backlight source and a color filter with an aperture, and since the claimed combination produces results that would not be expected from the results obtained from using these elements individually, the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 4 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection

with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 360842011300.

Dated: February 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7769